

AD-A096 298

DELAWARE UNIV NEWARK DEPT OF PSYCHOLOGY  
SPATIAL SELECTIVITY IN VISUAL SEARCH.(U)

F/6 5/10

OCT 80 J E HOFFMAN, B NELSON

N00014-78-C-0762

RR-8002

NL

UNCLASSIFIED

| OR |  
AD-A  
096298

image  
}

END

DATE

FILMED

4 -8

DTIC

12

DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY  
UNIVERSITY OF DELAWARE

RESEARCH REPORT  
SERIES

Spatial Selectivity in Visual Search

Report No. 8002


James E. Hoffman and Billie Nelson

Department of Psychology  
University of Delaware • Newark, Delaware 19711

LEVEL II

AD A 096298

DTIC  
SELECTED  
MAR 13 1981



October 1980

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.  
Reproduction in whole or in part is permitted for  
any purpose of the United States Government.

This research was sponsored by the Personnel and Training Research Programs,  
Psychological Sciences Division, Office of Naval Research, under Contract  
No. N00014-78-C-0762, Contract Authority Identification Number NR 150-425.

81 3 13 025

DBG FILE COPY

Unclassified

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER 8002 ✓	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO. AD A096 298	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) Spatial Selectivity in Visual Search.		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED Technical Report
7. AUTHOR(s) James E. Hoffman Billie Nelson		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER N00014-78-C-0762
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS Department of Psychology University of Delaware Newark, DE 19711		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS NR 150-425
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS Personnel and Training Research Programs Office of Naval Research (Code 458) Arlington, VA 22217		12. REPORT DATE Oct 1980
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office)		13. NUMBER OF PAGES 28
		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) Unclassified
		15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report)  Approved for public release; distribution unlimited		
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)		
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES		
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Attention Dual Task Spatial Selectivity Visual Search		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) To what extent does successful search for a target letter in a visual display depend on the allocation of attention to the target's spatial position? To investigate this question, we required subjects to discriminate the orientation of a briefly flashed u-shaped form while searching for a target letter. Performance operating characteristics (POC's) were derived by varying the relative amounts of attention subjects were to devote to each task. Extensive trade-offs in performance were observed when the orientation form and target letter occurred in nonadjacent display positions. In contrast, the		

DD FORM 1473  
1 JAN 73EDITION OF 1 NOV 65 IS OBSOLETE  
S/N 0102-014-6601Unclassified  
SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

402944

20. trade-off was much more restricted when the two targets occurred in adjacent positions. These results suggest that the interference between simultaneous visual discriminations depends critically on their separation in visual space. Both visual search and form discrimination require a common limited capacity visual resource.

21

Unclassified


# Spatial Selectivity in Visual Search

James E. Hoffman and Billie Nelson

Department of Psychology

University of Delaware

Newark, Delaware 19711



## Abstract

To what extent does successful search for a target letter in a visual display depend on the allocation of attention to the target's spatial position? To investigate this question, we required subjects to discriminate the orientation of a briefly flashed u-shaped form while searching for a target letter. Performance operating characteristics (POC's) were derived by varying the relative amounts of attention subjects were to devote to each task. Extensive trade-offs in performance were observed when the orientation form and target letter occurred in nonadjacent display positions. In contrast, the trade-off was much more restricted when the two targets occurred in adjacent positions. These results suggest that the interference between simultaneous visual discriminations depends critically on their separation in visual space. Both visual search and form discrimination require a common limited capacity visual resource.

This paper is concerned with the question of whether successful detection of a target letter in a visual array of letters depends on the allocation of attention to the spatial region containing the target. We introduce a method for measuring the location of a subject's visual attention and show that allocation of attention to visual targets is a component of the search process. Correct target detections are associated with allocation of attention to the spatial region containing the target whereas incorrect target detections are associated with allocation of attention to nontarget areas.

#### Spatial selective attention

Acquisition of information from text or pictures requires a series of saccadic eye movements in which the fovea is brought to bear on different parts of the input to provide high resolution processing of local details. A similar mechanism appears to operate within a single fixation; observers can use an attentional mechanism to selectively "scan" different regions of the input. For example, if one fixates a point on this page such as the preceding period, one can selectively "read" different letters in the area surrounding fixation. This is a central attentional process that we will refer to as spatial selective attention.

Although the phenomenology of spatial selectivity is compelling, its role in visual information processing is unclear. Consider the case of visual search for a target in which an observer views a briefly presented array of visual forms such as alphanumeric characters and must indicate whether or not any one of a set of predefined target characters is present in the array. To what extent must the observer shift his/her attention to each of the display characters to determine whether or not they are targets; and if such a shift of attention does occur, how similar is it to the process that one employs in

"reading" different letters arranged about a point of fixation? Consider first the evidence that indicates that spatial selectivity is a component of the search process.

Spatial selectivity in visual search

A persistent finding in visual search experiments is the display size effect. In general, as the number of nontarget display characters (distractors) increases, target detection accuracy decreases (Estes and Taylor, 1966; Schneider and Shriffrin, 1977; Hoffman, 1978, 1979). In addition, target detection latency increases as a linear function of display size suggesting that display characters are being examined by a serial process (Sternberg, Note 1; Schneider and Shiffrin, 1977). This serial scanning of display characters is presumably accomplished by the spatial selectivity mechanism.

There is, however, a compelling explanation of the display size effect that does not depend on serial scanning or indeed a capacity limitation of any kind. Eriksen and Spencer (1969) and Kinchla (1974) pointed out that a display size effect is predicted even by a model that assumes that classification of display elements is conducted by a parallel, independent channel, unlimited capacity process. As the number of display elements increases, so too does the probability that at least one distractor will be mistaken as a target. This increase in "noise" in the decision process leads to decreases in detection accuracy. Variants of the "perceptual confusions" model provide a remarkably good quantitative description of a wide variety of search experiments (Eriksen and Spencer, 1969; Kinchla, 1974; Lappin and Uttal, 1976).

Although the independent channels model offers a precise, quantitative description of detection performance in many experiments, there are situations in which its predictions are disconfirmed. Specifically, this model predicts that presentation of the display elements sequentially in time should not improve detection accuracy relative to simultaneous presentation. As long as the total number of potential confusions remains constant, the spatio-temporal aspects of presentation should be unimportant (assuming that peripheral factors such as masking, retinal location, etc. are controlled). Eriksen and Spencer (1969) and Shiffrin and Gardner (1973) confirmed this prediction. Hoffman (1978, 1979), however, found that sequential presentation could produce large increases in detection accuracy relative to simultaneous presentation. The crucial difference between experiments that do and do not find effects of sequential presentation appears to be the kind of training the subjects receive with the memory set. Eriksen and Spencer (1969) and Shiffrin and Gardner (1973) used a training schedule that Schneider and Shiffrin (1977) call consistent mapping (CM) in which target and distractor characters never exchange roles. CM training leads to "automatic detection" and therefore it may not be surprising that sequential presentation does not improve performance. In contrast, varied mapping (VM) training leads to controlled processing which is characterized as a serial search of the display. A serial search of the display should benefit from sequential presentation.

In summary, the visual search literature suggests that a spatial selection mechanism is a component of controlled processing while automatic processing does not require spatial selection. It would be desirable to have an independent measure of the location of a subject's attention in visual space. Such a measure would provide a means of verifying the presumably different roles played by spatial selection in controlled and automatic detection.



Measuring the location of visual attention

Figure 1 shows the proposed method for measuring the location of visual attention during visual search. The observer is required to perform two different tasks. One task is letter search in which the subject is to determine which of two target letters is present

-----  
 Insert Figure 1 About Here  
 -----

in the display. The second task is to determine the orientation of a briefly flashed u-shaped figure. If correct search trials are the result of the subject "scanning" the target position then we would expect that presenting the orientation target in a position adjacent to the target letter would produce better orientation discrimination than presenting it in nonadjacent positions. Conversely, if incorrect search trials are the result of the subject failing to attend to the target letter, orientation accuracy should be superior when the U occurs in positions nonadjacent to the target letter.

These spatial proximity effects are to be expected only if the spatial selectivity occurring during visual search shares important characteristics with the selectivity revealed by experiments that explicitly direct a subject's attention to a location in space. In particular, we are assuming that attention to a display letter will affect processing of adjacent forms. This assumption is clearly supported when attention is directed to a letter by a visual cue. It appears that there is a region approximately one degree of visual angle in extent centered on the attended position. Forms falling




Figure 1: A schematic representation of the temporal sequence of event on each trial. Subjects were required to indicate which member of a previously presented memory set (H or R) was present in a display as well as to determine the orientation of a briefly flashed U-shaped form.

within this "attentional field" are processed to a higher level than forms falling in other areas (Eriksen and Hoffman, 1972; Hoffman, 1975; Eriksen and Eriksen, 1974).

Attention appears to have a temporal extent as well as a spatial extent. Selection time appears to be a random variable with a minimum time of 50 msec (Hoffman, 1975) ranging up to some 300 msec (Colegate, Hoffman, and Eriksen, 1973). In order to encompass this range of times, the orientation symbol occurred in either the same frame as the target letter or the succeeding one.

#### Performance Operating Characteristics

The proposed method seeks to evaluate the role of spatial selective attention in visual search by observing how accuracy on an additional task (orientation discrimination) is influenced by the distance between the letter target and orientation form. In these circumstances, there is a good chance that our measurement procedure (orientation discrimination) may disturb the task in which we are really interested (visual search). For example, if subjects chose to "concentrate" on the orientation task we might find that the adjacency of the orientation symbol to the target letter improved search performance while orientation accuracy was unaffected. In order to assess the interaction of the two tasks across a wide range of strategies, we employed the method of "performance operating characteristics" (POC's) (Kinchla, 1980; Sperling and Melchner, 1978; Navon and Gopher, 1979). Subjects were instructed to vary the relative amounts of "attention" to be devoted to the two tasks. For example, they were instructed: "devote 80% of your attention to the search task and 20% to the orientation task." The resulting trade-off in performance between the two tasks across different attention instructions defines a POC.

If spatial attention is a mechanism that both tasks require and if it is a sharable resource (Navon and Gopher, 1979) only when forms fall within a single "attentional field" then we should observe quite different POC's for adjacent and nonadjacent targets. Specifically, nonadjacent targets should produce greater trade-offs in performance than adjacent targets because nonadjacent targets cannot efficiently share attention.

#### Method

Subjects. Subjects were 3 males and 1 female with normal or corrected to normal vision who were paid for their participation.

Apparatus and Stimuli. Presentation of visual displays and timing were provided by a PLATO V terminal which has a plasma panel screen. Timing was provided by the terminal's micro-processor, and had a period of approximately 7 msec. Letters and masks were  $.35^{\circ} \times .27^{\circ}$  of visual angle in height and width respectively and were defined on a 9x7 dot matrix. Four letters appeared in a circular display with a diameter of  $4.27^{\circ}$  of visual angle. The symbol used for the orientation task was defined on a 5x5 dot matrix, subtending a visual angle of  $.2^{\circ} \times .2^{\circ}$  and was always plotted  $.17^{\circ}$  toward the center of the circle from the letter display. Subjects responded by pressing keys on a typewriter style keyboard.

The luminance of a blank screen was .2 ft-L while a fully illuminated screen produced a luminance of 6.5 ft-L.

Procedure. Each subject served in 8 sessions. Each session consisted of 5 blocks of 64 trials. The display sequence was similar in each block, and the blocks differed only in instructional condition. Before each trial, subjects were shown two letters to associate with two key responses. Each trial display

of four letters then contained one of these target letters as well as the orientation form. The orientation form appeared with either the onset of the letter search display (same frame) or onset of the postmasks (successive frames). Subjects were required to press the appropriate key in response to the letter search, and then to indicate the symbol's orientation also by means of the keyboard.

In one of the blocks, subjects performed only the letter search task; in another block only the orientation discrimination task was required. In the remaining three blocks, subjects were asked to divide their attention between the two tasks in one of three ways: 80% search/20% orientation; 50% search/50% orientation; 20% search/80% orientation. Subjects were told to perform the search task as quickly and accurately as possible, with accuracy stressed over speed. No significant variation in RT's were observed and they will not be discussed in this report. The order of blocks within a session was random, with the constraint that across sessions each block be represented as equally as possible in the ordering.

On each trial, the subject was first presented with the memory set which remained on view until a key press initiated the following sequence. A fixation cross appeared in the center of the screen for 1 second followed by a sequence of 3 arrays. A typical sequence is shown in Figure 1. A set of 4 premasks appeared for 500 msec and then were replaced by the target array of letters. The duration of the letter array was dependent on each subject's search performance in preliminary tracking trials. The postmask letters then replaced the target array letters and remained in view until a response occurred. The orientation symbol appeared either at the time of trial array onset (same frame) or with postmask onset (successive frames). The symbol

remained on for a duration dependent on a second set of preliminary tracking trials performed on the orientation task. The tracking manipulated the display or symbol duration so that a subject's performance would approximate 75% accuracy on each single task. Each subject was required to do 24 trials of each task to satisfy this preliminary tracking procedure each session. The letter display duration, averaged across subjects and sessions, was 222 msec with a range for individual subjects of 198 to 235 msec. The orientation symbol duration was 105 msec with a range of 53 to 130 msec for individual subjects. At the end of each trial the subject received feedback concerning the accuracy of response on each task. No RT feedback was provided.

The subject initiated each trial with his/her left hand and indicated which letter of the memory set appeared in the display by pressing the appropriate key with the right hand. In blocks devoted only to the orientation discrimination task, the subject was similarly required to execute a motor response with the right hand. In this instance the right hand key press only brought the display of symbol orientations (with key numbers) to the screen so that an appropriate key could be selected.

A varied mapping procedure was used for the search task. The memory set as well as distractor letters were always taken randomly from the set [B, D, F, H, N, P, R, V]. Pre- and postmask letters were selected randomly without replacement from the remaining letters of the alphabet.

Within each orientation form onset condition, assignment of target letter to positions in the display was random but equally balanced across each of the four positions. The orientation symbol was presented randomly and equally next to the four display positions, with the additional constraint that the probe

occur equally in all positions relative to the target location. Within each block then, the spatial positions of target letter and orientation form were independent.

### Results

If spatial selectivity is a resource utilized in visual search and can be efficiently shared only by forms falling within a restricted attentional field, we should find different performance operating characteristics (POC's) for the case when targets from both tasks are adjacent to each other relative to when they are nonadjacent. Specifically, the POC for adjacent targets should be closer to the "independence point" in which dual task performance on each task is equivalent to corresponding single task performance.

Figure 2 shows that these expectations were confirmed. The left panel shows POC's for the case when the target letter and orientation symbol occurred in nonadjacent display positions. Independent performance of the two tasks would produce a POC at the intersection

-----  
Insert Figure 2 About Here  
-----

of a horizontal line through control performance of the orientation task (indicated by points on the ordinate) and a vertical line through control performance of the search task (indicated by points on the abscissa). It is clear that the empirical POC's are not located at the independence point even in the case where the targets occurred in successive frames. These two tasks are evidently almost totally incompatible. The POC's are approximately linear, in agreement with the POC's obtained by Sperling and Melchner (1978) for the case of two letter search tasks. Notice that if the same-frame POC's are




Figure 2: Performance operating characteristics for the case when the target letter and orientation form occurred in nonadjacent and adjacent display positions.



extrapolated to meet the point at which orientation performance is at single task levels, the search performance  $d'$  would be close to zero. In other words, were subjects to allocate 100% of their attention to the orientation task, they would have little knowledge of the search task target letter. In trying to extrapolate the POC in the other direction, to meet control performance on the search task, we encounter a difficulty. Control performance on the search task for the same frame condition is lower than control performance obtained in successive frame conditions and is lower than both control performance points for the adjacent targets condition. This finding suggests that when subjects were in the 100% search condition, the occurrence of the orientation symbol in another display position during the same frame was distracting. If we use the other three control conditions as possibly more appropriate estimates of letter search control performance, we find that the intersection of the "same frame" POC with search control performance results in an estimate of orientation  $d'$  of approximately zero.

In contrast, the intersection of the POC for successive frames with search control performance results in substantially above chance performance of the orientation task. Presumably, in the successive frames condition, the subject can partially reallocate attention from the search task to the orientation task when they are separated in time. The separation employed here was evidently not large enough to allow complete reallocation of attention between the two tasks.

We suggest that both the visual search task and the orientation discrimination task are competing for a spatial attention mechanism and that performance of either of these tasks is close to chance if spatial attention is fully deployed to nontarget display positions.

This conclusion is supported by an examination of the POC's for the case when both the orientation target and letter target were in adjacent display positions, shown in the right panel of Figure 2. First, consider the case of targets occurring in the same frame. All three dual task conditions show that search performance is close to the level achieved in the 100% search condition. In fact, when subjects are emphasizing search, as in the 80/20 condition (80% attention to the search task and 20% to orientation discrimination) their search performance is slightly better than control performance. Partial attention to the orientation task evidently allows its position in space to bias the starting point of the letter search and when both targets are in adjacent positions this bias is advantageous. As the subject shifts attention to the orientation task, this position advantage is partially offset by increased sharing of attention between the two discriminations.

Moving the orientation symbol to the frame following the search array had the effect of shifting the POC up and to the left in the case of adjacent targets. An upward shift indicates an improvement in orientation discrimination performance with temporal separation as occurred for nonadjacent targets. However, the leftward shift indicates decreased performance on the search task. This is clearly not a metacontrast effect of the after-occurring orientation form on the search target letter because it does not occur in the 100% search condition. A more likely explanation is that the position biasing effect of the orientation form on the search process is not as effective when it occurs after the array has been masked, just as delaying a partial report cue leads to a decline in identification of letters in iconic memory (Sperling, 1960).

The shape of the POC is instructive in this regard. When the subject is attending primarily to the letter search task (80/20 condition), performance on letter search in the adjacent targets/successive frames condition is slightly worse than the corresponding condition in the nonadjacent targets condition.

In other words, when the subject is concentrating on the search task, there is no advantage in having attention drawn to the target letter position after the letter array has been masked. If we now consider corresponding points for the case of the subject attending primarily to the orientation information (20/80 condition) we see a substantial advantage for the case of adjacent targets relative to nonadjacent targets. In fact, the POC for adjacent targets "bends around" so that search performance is better in the 20/80 condition relative to the 80/20 condition. This suggests that when the subject is concentrating on the orientation information, the allocation of spatial attention is "keyed" to the occurrence of the U-form. If this information does not occur until the frame following the letter array, the letter frame is held in a visual memory. This memory is probably post-iconic but visual in nature. When the orientation symbol occurs next to the target letter, it aids the "readout" of information in that area.

We suggest that the memory for the display is a visual, post-iconic one for several reasons. It appears to be visual because it is clearly preserving the positional information of the array letters. We suspect it is post-iconic because the masks should have made it very difficult to read information from iconic memory. Several other authors have postulated a visual memory that is intermediate between iconic and long-term visual memory (Sperling and Reeves, 1980; Turvey, 1978).

A repeated measures analysis of variance revealed that the effects described above were reliable. For search performance, both the main effect of adjacent vs nonadjacent targets [ $F(1,3)=283, p<.001$ ] and its interactions with instructional condition [ $F(3,9)=6.06, p<.025$ ] were significant. The effect of same vs successive frames interacted significantly with whether targets were adjacent or not [ $F(1,3)=18.3, p<.025$ ] while the main effect of same/successive frames was not significant [ $F(1,3)<1$ ].

For orientation discrimination, both the main effects of instructions [ $F(3,9)=29.7, p<.001$ ], and same vs. successive frames [ $F(1,3)=37.6, p<.001$ ] as well as their interaction were significant [ $F(3,9)=5.9, p<.025$ ]. The last interaction is a bit misleading. As can be seen in Figure 2, the effects of these variables are almost perfectly additive, but the POC's are both approaching the same control performance level from different starting points.

#### Contingency analyses

Recall that we were interested in measuring the spatial attention demands of visual search by observing the effect of target adjacency on the ability to discriminate the orientation of a briefly flashed form. The above analyses clearly show that letter search was improved when the orientation form occurred adjacent to the target letter relative to nonadjacent positions. The effect of the target letter position on orientation discrimination was, however, obscured in the above analyses. The position of the orientation form was always apparent even when the discrimination was incorrect. In contrast, any effects of position of the target letter should depend on whether the target was correctly detected. Consequently we examined orientation discrimination contingent on the success of the letter search task.

Table 1 shows orientation discrimination contingent on correct and incorrect search. When search was correct, the orientation symbol was discriminated more accurately when it occurred adjacent to the

-----  
Insert Table 1 About Here  
-----

target relative to nonadjacent positions;  $F(1,3)=18.2$ ,  $p<.025$ . Surprisingly, this effect was independent of whether the orientation symbol occurred in the same frame as the target or the successive one,  $F(1,3)<1$ .

When search was incorrect, the data suggest that the orientation symbol was discriminated better when it occurred in positions removed from the target letter. This effect just missed significance;  $F(1,3)=6.7$ ,  $p<.10$ . We suspect it is a real one, however, since all four subjects showed this pattern although to varying degrees.

This pattern of results is consistent with a search process in which attention to the spatial position of the target is a key ingredient for successful performance. Correct detection of the target letter results in improved processing of other information in the same general area as the target. When the target letter is not found, discrimination of material in the target area is suppressed relative to other positions. These results are compatible with the conclusions derived from the POC analyses described earlier.

#### Discussion

The goal of this experiment was to determine whether successful detection of a target letter in varied mapping visual search was dependent on spatial allocation of attention to the display region containing the target. This

TABLE 1  
 Proportion correct orientation discrimination  
 contingent on correct and incorrect search

Concurrent event	Frame	Location	
		Adjacent	Nonadjacent
Search Correct	Same	.61	.53
	Succ	.73	.65
Search Incorrect	Same	.50	.57
	Succ	.60	.69

Note: Same = Same frame; Succ = Successive frames.

question was investigated by pairing the visual search task with a concurrent task of discriminating the orientation of a briefly flashed U-shaped target. This orientation symbol could either occur in a position adjacent or nonadjacent to the target letter.

Our results suggest that spatial attention to the target letter is a necessary component of successful search performance. The empirical performance operating characteristics (POC's) representing joint discrimination accuracy on the two tasks were quite different in the cases of adjacent and nonadjacent targets. When the target letter and orientation symbol occurred in different or nonadjacent display areas, there was an extensive trade-off in performance of the two tasks. Indeed, when the letter array and orientation symbol occurred simultaneously, the POC's suggested that 100% attention to either task would result in near chance performance of the other.

In contrast, when the orientation symbol occurred in the same frame and in the position adjacent to the target letter, search performance was close to the level obtained in the single task control condition. Moving the orientation symbol to the succeeding frame actually decreased search performance for adjacent targets indicating that the orientation symbol was less effective in manipulating attention to an object that had been masked.

Successful discrimination of the target letter also resulted in an increase in orientation discrimination accuracy for adjacent targets relative to the case when they were nonadjacent. This relation was reversed when the subject failed to accurately detect the target. These results indicate that successful detection of a target letter is associated with attention to the

spatial region of the target and, in addition, that errors in detection are associated with attention being deployed to display regions not containing the target.

One way to conceptualize these results is as follows. Suppose that there is a limited visual processing resource that can be spread "thinly" over a wide area or concentrated in a restricted area. When there is spatial uncertainty concerning the location of targets, as in the present study, the subject begins the trial with attention in a "distributed state". In the case of letter search, we assume that the subject begins to accumulate information in parallel from each letter concerning the likelihood that it is a target. When the information in a particular location is sufficiently high to suggest the presence of a target, attention is allocated to that position resulting in better processing of information in the target area and reduced processing of information in other areas (Shaw and Shaw, 1977; Shaw, 1978).

In dual task conditions we assume that the allocation of visual attention can be triggered by either one of two events: the occurrence of the orientation symbol or the information accumulation process described above. The different attentional instructions used in the present study serve to determine the priority of these two different triggering mechanisms. Increasing the emphasis on one task increases the likelihood that it is that task that will control the allocation of attention. When the critical information for both tasks is located in the same area, there is less of a trade-off in performance because either task can at least partially share the attention triggered by the other. In contrast, when the targets are in different areas, the attentional field cannot be shared and targets must be dealt with sequentially. According to this model, search errors result when a



nontarget letter triggers an attention shift. This results in a withdrawal of attention from other areas of the display and would produce higher accuracy in discriminating the orientation symbol when it occurred in nonadjacent display positions, in agreement with the results of the present study.

Why invoke the notion of limited capacity, especially in view of the success of recent models that attribute all attentional limitations to memory and decision processes (cf., Eriksen and Spencer, 1969; Shiffrin, 1978; Schneider and Shiffrin, 1977; Hoffman, 1978, 1979; Duncan, 1980)? In considering this issue it would first be useful to have a general characterization of late selection models.

Models that assume no limitation in "early" processing of the signal usually take the following form. Each letter in the display is represented by a random variable reflecting the likelihood that the letter is a target. The mean and variance of this random variable are independent of the attention that subjects allocate to its spatial position as well as the number of other simultaneous inputs (Eriksen and Spencer, 1969; Kinchla, 1974; Hoffman, 1978, 1979). The effect of attentional instructions may be to differentially weight these inputs when they are combined for the final decision (Kinchla, 1974). Alternatively, these signals may decay or be masked by subsequent input if they must enter a limited capacity decision system in a serial manner (Schneider and Shiffrin, 1977; Duncan, 1980). Either way, the effect of designating the spatial position of the target is to give it an advantage at the decision level relative to other competing inputs.

This approach faces difficulty in explaining any advantages in spatial allocation of attention to a target when it is the only form presented. Shaw and Shaw (1977) showed that recognition accuracy of a single letter was

affected by the spatial allocation of attention to its position in space. Bashinski and Bacharach (1980) report a similar finding for a visual detection task. Similar effects for recognition latency were found by Eriksen and Hoffman (1974) and for detection latency by Posner, Snyder, and Davidson (1980). Unless one supposes that empty display positions are providing noise to a central decision process, these results seem to be strong evidence for an "early" effect of attention.

Notice that in the present study a similar advantage of spatial allocation of attention was observed. The discrimination of the orientation symbol was improved when it occurred in a position to which the subject was attending relative to the discrimination obtained for unattended positions. The shapes of the POC's as well as the results of the contingency analyses indicated that a component of processing the orientation symbol was attending to its position in space even though the display contained no other symbols that would be confusable with the orientation form. It is probably the case that both discriminations (search and orientation) are competing for a limited capacity decision mechanism. If this were the only source of interference, however, we would not have observed the strong spatial dependencies between task performance observed in the present study.

Related Work. Our experiment is quite similar to experiments conducted by Treisman and Geffen (1967), and Treisman and Riley (1969). They asked subjects who were engaged in a shadowing task to also detect target words which could occur either in the shadowed or unshadowed message. They found that targets were better detected when they occurred in the shadowed message, in agreement with our results for visual "messages" occurring in the same spatial location.

This experiment is also similar to others that have attempted to measure the spatio-temporal distribution of visual attention (Eriksen and Hoffman, 1972; Shulman, Remington, and McLean, 1979; Posner, Snyder, and Davidson, 1980). Our results together with these previous studies demonstrate that visual attention is a resource that can be distributed in space to differentially affect latency and accuracy of basic recognition and detection processes.

Conclusion. The successful detection of a target letter in a visual array is associated with allocation of attention to the spatial region of the target. Forms that occur within this attentional field are better discriminated than forms occurring elsewhere in the display. The ability to process simultaneous visual signals depends crucially on their relative locations in space.

An interesting question is the extent to which "automatic detection" processes (Schneider and Shiffrin, 1977) depend on a similar spatial attention mechanism. We are currently investigating this question.

Footnotes

1. A preliminary analysis of positions that were nonadjacent to the target letter failed to reveal any systematic differences in the three nonadjacent positions. Consequently, they were averaged to produce the "nonadjacent" category.

Reference Notes

Sternberg, S. Scanning a persisting visual image vs. a memorized list. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Eastern Psychological Association, Boston, MA, April, 1967.

# References

- Bashinski, H.S. & Bacharach, V.R. Enhancement of perceptual sensitivity as the result of selectively attending to spatial locations. Perception and Psychophysics, 1980, 28, 241-248.
- Colegate, R.L., Hoffman, J.E., & Eriksen, C.W. Selective encoding from multielement visual displays. Perception and Psychophysics, 1973, 14, 217-224.
- Duncan, J. The locus of interference in the perception of simultaneous stimuli. Psychological Review, 1980, 87, 272-300.
- Eriksen, B.A. & Eriksen, C.W. Effects of noise letters upon the identification of a target letter in a nonsearch task. Perception and Psychophysics, 1974, 16, 143-149.
- Eriksen, C.W. & Hoffman, J.E. Temporal and spatial characteristics of selective encoding from visual displays. Perception and Psychophysics, 1972, 12, 201-204.
- Eriksen, C.W. & Spencer, T. Rate of information processing in visual perception: Some results and methodological considerations. Journal of Experimental Psychology Monograph, 969, 79, No. 2, Part 2.
- Estes, W.K. & Taylor, H.A. Visual detection in relation to display in relation to display size and redundancy of critical elements. Perception and Psychophysics, 1966, 1, 9-16.
- Hoffman, J.E. Hierarchical stages in the processing of visual information. Perception and Psychophysics, 1975, 18, 348-354.
- Hoffman, J.E. Search through a sequentially presented visual display. Perception and Psychophysics, 1978, 23, 1-11.
- Hoffman, J.E. A two-stage model of visual search. Perception and Psychophysics, 1979, 25, 319-327.

- Kinchla, R.A. Detecting target elements in multielement arrays: A confusibility model. Perception and Psychophysics, 1974, 15, 149-158.
- Kinchla, R.A. The measurement of attention. In R.S. Nickerson (Ed.), Attention and Performance VIII. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, 1980.
- Lappin, J.S. & Uttal, W.R. Does prior knowledge facilitate the detection of visual targets in random noise? Perception and Psychophysics, 1976, 20, 365-374.
- Navon, D. & Gopher, D. On the economy of the human-processing system. Psychological Review, 1979, 86, 214-255.
- Posner, M.I., Snyder, C.R.R., & Davidson, B.J. Attention and the detection of signals. Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, 1980, 109, 160-174.
- Schneider, W. & Shiffrin, R.M. Controlled and automatic human information processing: I. detection, search, and attention. Psychological Review, 1977, 84, 1-66.
- Shaw, M.L. A capacity allocation model for reaction time. Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance, 1978, 4, 586-598.
- Shaw, M. & Shaw, A. Optimal allocation of cognitive resources to spatial locations. Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance, 1977, 3, 201-211.
- Shiffrin, R.M. Capacity limitations in information processing, attention, and memory. In W.K. Estes (Ed.), Handbook of learning and cognitive processes, (Vol. 4), Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, 1978.
- Shiffrin, R.M. & Gardner, G.T. Visual processing capacity and attentional control. Journal of Experimental Psychology, 1972, 93, 72-82.

Shulman, G.L., Remington, R.W., & McLean, J.P. Moving attention through space.

Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance,  
1979, 5, 522-526.

Sperling, G. The information available in brief visual presentations.

Psychological Monographs, 1960, 74, (No. 11, Whole No. 498).

Sperling, G. & Melchner, M.J. The attention operating characteristic:

Examples from visual search. Science, 1978, 202, 315-318.

Sperling, G. & Reeves, A. Measuring the reaction time of a shift of visual

attention. In R.S. Nickerson (Ed.), Attention and Performance VIII.

Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, 1980.

Treisman, A.M. & Geffen, G. Selective attention: Perception or response?

Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology, 1967, 19, 1-17.

Treisman, A.M. & Riley, R.G. Is selective attention selective perception or

selective response? A further test. Journal of Experimental Psychology,  
1969, 79, 27-34.

Turvey, M.T. Visual processing and short-term memory. In W.K. Estes (Ed.),

Handbook of learning and cognitive processes, (Vol. 5), Hillsdale, NJ:

Erlbaum, 1978.



# DISTRIBUTION LIST

## Navy

- |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Meryl S. Baker<br>NPRDC<br>Code P309<br>San Diego, CA 92152   | 1 | Dr. Patrick R. Harrison<br>Psychology Course Director<br>LEADERSHIP & LAW DEPT. (7b)<br>DIV. OF PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT<br>U.S. NAVAL ACADEMY<br>ANNAPOLIS, MD 21402 |
| 1 | Dr. Robert Breaux<br>Code N-711<br>NAVTRAEQUIPCEN<br>Orlando, FL 32813  | 1 | Dr. Jim Hollan<br>Code 304<br>Navy Personnel R & D Center<br>San Diego, CA 92152  |
| 1 | Chief of Naval Education and Training<br>Liason Office<br>Air Force Human Resource Laboratory<br>Flying Training Division<br>WILLIAMS AFB, AZ 85224 | 1 | CDR Charles W. Hutchins<br>Naval Air Systems Command Hq<br>AIR-340F<br>Navy Department<br>Washington, DC 20361  |
| 1 | Dr. Larry Dean, LT, MSC, USN<br>Psychology Department<br>Naval Submarine Medical Research Lab<br>Naval Submarine Base<br>Groton, CT 06340           | 1 | CDR Robert S. Kennedy<br>Head, Human Performance Sciences<br>Naval Aerospace Medical Research Lab<br>Box 29407<br>New Orleans, LA 70189                               |
| 1 | Dr. Richard Elster<br>Department of Administrative Sciences<br>Naval Postgraduate School<br>Monterey, CA 93940                                      | 1 | Dr. Norman J. Kerr<br>Chief of Naval Technical Training<br>Naval Air Station Memphis (75)<br>Millington, TN 38054   |
| 1 | DR. PAT FEDERICO<br>NAVY PERSONNEL R&D CENTER<br>SAN DIEGO, CA 92152  | 1 | Dr. William L. Maloy<br>Principal Civilian Advisor for<br>Education and Training<br>Naval Training Command, Code 00A<br>Pensacola, FL 32508                           |
| 1 | Mr. Paul Foley<br>Navy Personnel R&D Center<br>San Diego, CA 92152  | 1 | Dr. Kneale Marshall<br>Scientific Advisor to DCNO(MPT)<br>OP01T<br>Washington DC 20370  |
| 1 | Dr. John Ford<br>Navy Personnel R&D Center<br>San Diego, CA 92152   | 1 | CAPT Richard L. Martin, USN<br>Prospective Commanding Officer<br>USS Carl Vinson (CVN-70)<br>Newport News Shipbuilding and Drydock Co<br>Newport News, VA 23607       |
| 1 | Dr. Henry M. Halff<br>Department of Psychology, C-009<br>University of California at San Diego<br>La Jolla, CA 92093                                | 1 | Dr. James McBride<br>Navy Personnel R&D Center<br>San Diego, CA 92152   |
| 1 | LT Steven D. Harris, MSC, USN<br>Code 6021<br>Naval Air Development Center<br>Warminster, Pennsylvania 18974  |   |   |

# Navy

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>1 Dr. George Moeller<br/>Head, Human Factors Dept.<br/>Naval Submarine Medical Research Lab<br/>Groton, CN 06340</p> <p>1 Dr William Montague<br/>Navy Personnel R&amp;D Center<br/>San Diego, CA 92152</p> <p>1 Library<br/>Naval Health Research Center<br/>P. O. Box 85122<br/>San Diego, CA 92138</p> <p>1 Naval Medical R&amp;D Command<br/>Code 44<br/>National Naval Medical Center<br/>Bethesda, MD 20014</p> <p>1 Ted M. I. Yellen<br/>Technical Information Office, Code 201<br/>NAVY PERSONNEL R&amp;D CENTER<br/>SAN DIEGO, CA 92152</p> <p>1 Library, Code P201L<br/>Navy Personnel R&amp;D Center<br/>San Diego, CA 92152</p> <p>6 Commanding Officer<br/>Naval Research Laboratory<br/>Code 2627<br/>Washington, DC 20390</p> <p>1 Psychologist<br/>ONR Branch Office<br/>Bldg 114, Section D<br/>666 Summer Street<br/>Boston, MA 02210</p> <p>1 Psychologist<br/>ONR Branch Office<br/>536 S. Clark Street<br/>Chicago, IL 60605</p> <p>1 Office of Naval Research<br/>Code 437<br/>800 N. Quincy Street<br/>Arlington, VA 22217</p> | <p>1 Office of Naval Research<br/>Code 441<br/>800 N. Quincy Street<br/>Arlington, VA 22217</p> <p>5 Personnel &amp; Training Research Programs<br/>(Code 458)<br/>Office of Naval Research<br/>Arlington, VA 22217</p> <p>1 Psychologist<br/>ONR Branch Office<br/>1030 East Green Street<br/>Pasadena, CA 91101</p> <p>1 Office of the Chief of Naval Operations<br/>Research Development &amp; Studies Branch<br/>(OP-115)<br/>Washington, DC 20350</p> <p>1 Dr. Donald F. Parker<br/>Graduate School of Business Administration<br/>University of Michigan<br/>Ann Arbor, MI 48109</p> <p>1 LT Frank C. Petho, MSC, USN (Ph.D)<br/>Code L51<br/>Naval Aerospace Medical Research Laboratory<br/>Pensacola, FL 32508</p> <p>1 Roger W. Remington, Ph.D<br/>Code L52<br/>NAMRL<br/>Pensacola, FL 32508</p> <p>1 Dr. Bernard Rimland (03B)<br/>Navy Personnel R&amp;D Center<br/>San Diego, CA 92152</p> <p>1 Dr. Worth Scanland<br/>Chief of Naval Education and Training<br/>Code N-5<br/>NAS, Pensacola, FL 32508</p> <p>1 Dr. Sam Schiflett, SY 721<br/>Systems Engineering Test Directorate<br/>U.S. Naval Air Test Center<br/>Patuxent River, MD 20670</p> |
|--|---|

# Navy

- 1 Dr. Robert G. Smith  
Office of Chief of Naval Operations  
OP-987H  
Washington, DC 20350
- 1 Dr. Alfred F. Snode  
Training Analysis & Evaluation Group  
(TAEG)  
Dept. of the Navy  
Orlando, FL 32813
- 1 W. Gary Thomson  
Naval Ocean Systems Center  
Code 7132  
San Diego, CA 92152
- 1 Roger Weissinger-Baylon  
Department of Administrative Sciences  
Naval Postgraduate School  
Monterey, CA 93940
- 1 Dr. Ronald Weitzman  
Code 54 WZ  
Department of Administrative Sciences  
U. S. Naval Postgraduate School  
Monterey, CA 93940
- 1 Dr. Robert Wisher  
Code 309  
Navy Personnel R&D Center  
San Diego, CA 92152
- 1 DR. MARTIN F. WISKOFF  
NAVY PERSONNEL R & D CENTER  
SAN DIEGO, CA 92152
- 1 Mr John H. Wolfe  
Code P310  
U. S. Navy Personnel Research and  
Development Center  
San Diego, CA 92152

# Army

- 1 Technical Director  
U. S. Army Research Institute for the  
Behavioral and Social Sciences  
5001 Eisenhower Avenue  
Alexandria, VA 22333
- 1 HQ USAREUE & 7th Army  
ODCSOPS  
USAREUE Director of GED  
APO New York 09403
- 1 DR. RALPH DUSEK  
U.S. ARMY RESEARCH INSTITUTE  
5001 EISENHOWER AVENUE  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22333
- 1 Dr. Dexter Fletcher  
U.S. Army Research Institute  
5001 Eisenhower Avenue  
Alexandria, VA 22333
- 1 Dr. Michael Kaplan  
U.S. ARMY RESEARCH INSTITUTE  
5001 EISENHOWER AVENUE  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22333
- 1 Dr. Milton S. Katz  
Training Technical Area  
U.S. Army Research Institute  
5001 Eisenhower Avenue  
Alexandria, VA 22333
- 1 Dr. Harold F. O'Neil, Jr.  
Attn: PERI-OK  
Army Research Institute  
5001 Eisenhower Avenue  
Alexandria, VA 22333
- 1 Dr. Robert Sasmor  
U. S. Army Research Institute for the  
Behavioral and Social Sciences  
5001 Eisenhower Avenue  
Alexandria, VA 22333
- 1 Dr. Joseph Ward  
U.S. Army Research Institute  
5001 Eisenhower Avenue  
Alexandria, VA 22333

## Air Force

- 1 Air University Library  
AUL/LSE 76/443  
Maxwell AFB, AL 36112
- 1 Dr. Earl A. Alluisi  
HQ, AFHRL (AFSC)  
Brooks AFB, TX 78235
- 1 Dr. Genevieve Haddad  
Program Manager  
Life Sciences Directorate  
AFOSR  
Bolling AFB, DC 20332
- 1 Dr. Ronald G. Hughes  
AFHRL/OTR  
Williams AFB, AZ 85224
- 1 Dr. Malcolm Ree  
AFHRL/MP  
Brooks AFB, TX 78235
- 1 Dr. Marty Rockway  
Technical Director  
AFHRL(OT)  
Williams AFB, AZ 58224
- 2 3700 TCHTW/TTGH Stop 32  
Sheppard AFB, TX 76311
- 1 Jack A. Thorp, Maj., USAF  
Life Sciences Directorate  
AFOSR  
Bolling AFB, DC 20332

## Marines

- 1 H. William Greenup  
Education Advisor (E031)  
Education Center, MCDEC  
Quantico, VA 22134
- 1 Headquarters, U. S. Marine Corps  
Code MPI-20  
Washington, DC 20380
- 1 Special Assistant for Marine  
Corps Matters  
Code 100M  
Office of Naval Research  
800 N. Quincy St.  
Arlington, VA 22217
- 1 DR. A.L. SLAFKOSKY  
SCIENTIFIC ADVISOR (CODE RD-1)  
HQ, U.S. MARINE CORPS  
WASHINGTON, DC 20380

CoastGuard

Other DoD

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>1 Chief, Psychological Reserch Branch<br/>U. S. Coast Guard (G-P-1/2/TP42)<br/>Washington, DC 20593</p> <p>1 Mr. Thomas A. Warm<br/>U. S. Coast Guard Institute<br/>P. O. Substation 18<br/>Oklahoma City, OK 73169</p> | <p>12 Defense Technical Information Center<br/>Cameron Station, Bldg 5<br/>Alexandria, VA 22314<br/>Attn: TC</p> <p>1 Military Assistant for Training and<br/>Personnel Technology<br/>Office of the Under Secretary of Defense<br/>for Research &amp; Engineering<br/>Room 3D129, The Pentagon<br/>Washington, DC 20301</p> |
|--|--|

# Civil Govt

- 1 Dr. Susan Chipman  
Learning and Development  
National Institute of Education  
1200 19th Street NW  
Washington, DC 20208
- 1 Dr. Joseph I. Lipson  
SEDR W-638  
National Science Foundation  
Washington, DC 20550
- 1 William J. McLaurin  
Rm. 301, Internal Revenue Service  
2221 Jefferson Davis Highway  
Arlington, VA 22202
- 1 Dr. Andrew R. Molnar  
Science Education Dev.  
and Research  
National Science Foundation  
Washington, DC 20550
- 1 Personnel R&D Center  
Office of Personnel Managment  
1900 E Street NW  
Washington, DC 20415
- 1 Dr. H. Wallace Sinaiko  
Program Director  
Manpower Research and Advisory Services  
Smithsonian Institution  
801 North Pitt Street  
Alexandria, VA 22314
- 1 Dr. Frank Withrow  
U. S. Office of Education  
400 Maryland Ave. SW  
Washington, DC 20202
- 1 Dr. Joseph L. Young, Director  
Memory & Cognitive Processes  
National Science Foundation  
Washington, DC 20550

# Non Govt

- 1 Dr. John R. Anderson  
Department of Psychology  
Carnegie Mellon University  
Pittsburgh, PA 15213
- 1 Dr. John Annett  
Department of Psychology  
University of Warwick  
Coventry CV4 7AL  
ENGLAND
- 1 DR. MICHAEL ATWOOD  
SCIENCE APPLICATIONS INSTITUTE  
40 DENVER TECH. CENTER WEST  
7935 E. PRENTICE AVENUE  
ENGLEWOOD, CO 80110
- 1 1 psychological research unit  
Dept. of Defense (Army Office)  
Campbell Park Offices  
Canberra ACT 2600, Australia
- 1 Dr. Alan Baddeley  
Medical Research Council  
Applied Psychology Unit  
15 Chaucer Road  
Cambridge CB2 2EF  
ENGLAND
- 1 Dr. Patricia Baggett  
Department of Psychology  
University of Denver  
University Park  
Denver, CO 80208
- 1 Dr. Jackson Beatty  
Department of Psychology  
University of California  
Los Angeles, CA 90024
- 1 Dr. Isaac Bejar  
Educational Testing Service  
Princeton, NJ 08450
- 1 Dr. Ina Rilodeau  
Department of Psychology  
Tulane University  
New Orleans, LA 70118

Non Govt

- 1 Dr. Nicholas A. Bond  
Dept. of Psychology  
Sacramento State College  
600 Jay Street  
Sacramento, CA 95819
- Dr. Lyle Bourne  
Department of Psychology  
University of Colorado  
Boulder, CO 80309
- 1 Dr. Robert Brennan  
American College Testing Programs  
P. O. Box 168  
Iowa City, IA 52240
- 1 Dr. Bruce Buchanan  
Department of Computer Science  
Stanford University  
Stanford, CA 94305
- 1 DR. C. VICTOR BUNDERSON  
WICAT INC.  
UNIVERSITY PLAZA, SUITE 10  
1160 SO. STATE ST.  
OREM, UT 84057
- 1 Dr. Pat Carpenter  
Department of Psychology  
Carnegie-Mellon University  
Pittsburgh, PA 15213
- 1 Dr. John B. Carroll  
Psychometric Lab  
Univ. of No. Carolina  
Davie Hall 013A  
Chapel Hill, NC 27514
- 1 Charles Myers Library  
Livingstone House  
Livingstone Road  
Stratford  
London E15 2LJ  
ENGLAND
- 1 Dr. William Chase  
Department of Psychology  
Carnegie Mellon University  
Pittsburgh, PA 15213
- 1 Dr. Kenneth E. Clark  
College of Arts & Sciences  
University of Rochester  
River Campus Station  
Rochester, NY 14627
- 1 Dr. Norman Cliff  
Dept. of Psychology  
Univ. of So. California  
University Park  
Los Angeles, CA 90007
- 1 Dr. Lynn A. Cooper  
LRDC  
University of Pittsburgh  
3939 O'Hara Street  
Pittsburgh, PA 15213
- 1 Dr. Meredith P. Crawford  
American Psychological Association  
1200 17th Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20036
- 1 Dr. Kenneth B. Cross  
Anacapa Sciences, Inc.  
P.O. Drawer Q  
Santa Barbara, CA 93102
- 1 Dr. Ronna Dillon  
Department of Guidance and Educational P  
Southern Illinois University  
Carbondale, IL 62901
- 1 Dr. Emmanuel Donchin  
Department of Psychology  
University of Illinois  
Champaign, IL 61820
- 1 Dr. Hubert Dreyfus  
Department of Philosophy  
University of California  
Berkely, CA 94720
- 1 Dr. William Dunlap  
Department of Psychology  
Tulane University  
New Orleans, LA 70118

Non Govt

- |   |   |   |  |
|---|---|---|--|
| 1 | LCOL J. C. Eggenberger<br>DIRECTORATE OF PERSONNEL APPLIED RESEARC<br>NATIONAL DEFENCE HQ<br>101 COLONEL BY DRIVE<br>OTTAWA, CANADA K1A 0K2 | 1 | Dr. Daniel Gopher<br>Industrial & Management Engineering<br>Technion-Israel Institute of Technology<br>Haifa<br>ISRAEL |
| 1 | ERIC Facility-Acquisitions<br>4833 Rugby Avenue<br>Bethesda, MD 20014   | 1 | DR. JAMES G. GREENO<br>LRDC<br>UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH<br>3939 O'HARA STREET<br>PITTSBURGH, PA 15213                  |
| 1 | Dr. Richard L. Ferguson<br>The American College Testing Program<br>P.O. Box 168<br>Iowa City, IA 52240                                      | 1 | Dr. Harold Hawkins<br>Department of Psychology<br>University of Oregon<br>Eugene OR 97403                              |
| 1 | Dr. Edwin A. Fleishman<br>Advanced Research Resources Organ.<br>Suite 900<br>4330 East West Highway<br>Washington, DC 20014                 | 1 | Glenda Greenwald, Ed.<br>"Human Intelligence Newsletter"<br>P. O. Box 1163<br>Birmingham, MI 48012                     |
| 1 | Dr. John R. Frederiksen<br>Bolt Beranek & Newman<br>50 Moulton Street<br>Cambridge, MA 02138  | 1 | Dr. Lloyd Humphreys<br>Department of Psychology<br>University of Illinois<br>Champaign, IL 61820                       |
| 1 | Dr. Alinda Friedman<br>Department of Psychology<br>University of Alberta<br>Edmonton, Alberta<br>CANADA T6G 2E9                             | 1 | Library<br>HumRRO/Western Division<br>27857 Berwick Drive<br>Carmel, CA 93921  |
| 1 | Dr. R. Edward Geiselman<br>Department of Psychology<br>University of California<br>Los Angeles, CA 90024                                    | 1 | Dr. Earl Hunt<br>Dept. of Psychology<br>University of Washington<br>Seattle, WA 98105                                  |
| 1 | DR. ROBERT GLASER<br>LRDC<br>UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH<br>3939 O'HARA STREET<br>PITTSBURGH, PA 15213   | 1 | Dr. Steven W. Keele<br>Dept. of Psychology<br>University of Oregon<br>Eugene, OR 97403                                 |
| 1 | Dr. Marvin D. Glock<br>217 Stone Hall<br>Cornell University<br>Ithaca, NY 14853   | 1 | Dr. David Kieras<br>Department of Psychology<br>University of Arizona<br>Tuscon, AZ 85721                              |



Non Govt

- 1 Dr. Kenneth A. Klivington  
Program Officer  
Alfred P. Sloan Foundation  
630 Fifth Avenue  
New York, NY 10111
- Dr. Stephen Kosslyn  
Harvard University  
Department of Psychology  
33 Kirkland Street  
Cambridge, MA 02138
- 1 Mr. Marlin Kroger  
1117 Via Goleta  
Palos Verdes Estates, CA 90274
- 1 Dr. Jill Larkin  
Department of Psychology  
Carnegie Mellon University  
Pittsburgh, PA 15213
- 1 Dr. Alan Lesgold  
Learning R&D Center  
University of Pittsburgh  
Pittsburgh, PA 15260
- 1 Dr. Charles Lewis  
Faculteit Sociale Wetenschappen  
Rijksuniversiteit Groningen  
Oude Boteringestraat  
Groningen  
NETHERLANDS
- 1 Dr. James Lumsden  
Department of Psychology  
University of Western Australia  
Nedlands W.A. 6009  
AUSTRALIA
- 1 Dr. Erik McWilliams  
Science Education Dev. and Research  
National Science Foundation  
Washington, DC 20550
- 1 Dr. Mark Miller  
Computer Science Laboratory  
Texas Instruments, Inc.  
Mail Station 371, P.O. Box 225936  
Dallas, TX 75265
- 1 Dr. Allen Munro  
Behavioral Technology Laboratories  
1845 Elena Ave., Fourth Floor  
Redondo Beach, CA 90277
- 1 Dr. Donald A Norman  
Dept. of Psychology C-009  
Univ. of California, San Diego  
La Jolla, CA 92093
- 1 Dr. Melvin R. Novick  
356 Lindquist Center for Measurment  
University of Iowa  
Iowa City, IA 52242
- 1 Dr. Jesse Orlansky  
Institute for Defense Analyses  
400 Army Navy Drive  
Arlington, VA 22202
- 1 Dr. Seymour A. Papert  
Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
Artificial Intelligence Lab  
545 Technology Square  
Cambridge, MA 02139
- 1 Dr. James A. Paulson  
Portland State University  
P.O. Box 751  
Portland, OR 97207
- 1 MR. LUIGI PETRULLO  
2431 N. EDGEWOOD STREET  
ARLINGTON, VA 22207
- 1 Dr. Martha Polson  
Department of Psychology  
University of Colorado  
Boulder, CO 80302
- 1 DR. PETER POLSON  
DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY  
UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO  
BOULDER, CO 80309
- 1 Dr. Steven E. Poltrock  
Department of Psychology  
University of Denver  
Denver, CO 80208

Non Govt

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>1 DR. DIANE M. RAMSEY-KLEE<br/>R-K RESEARCH &amp; SYSTEM DESIGN<br/>3947 RIDGEMONT DRIVE<br/>MALIBU, CA 90265</p>                     | <p>1 Committee on Cognitive Research<br/>% Dr. Lonnie R. Sherrod<br/>Social Science Research Council<br/>605 Third Avenue<br/>New York, NY 10016</p>      |
| <p>1 MINRAT M. L. RAUCH<br/>P II 4<br/>BUNDESMINISTERIUM DER VERTEIDIGUNG<br/>POSTFACH 1328<br/>D-53 BONN 1, GERMANY</p>                 | <p>1 Robert S. Siegler<br/>Associate Professor<br/>Carnegie-Mellon University<br/>Department of Psychology<br/>Schenley Park<br/>Pittsburgh, PA 15213</p> |
| <p>1 Dr. Mark D. Reckase<br/>Educational Psychology Dept.<br/>University of Missouri-Columbia<br/>4 Hill Hall<br/>Columbia, MO 65211</p> | <p>1 Dr. Edward E. Smith<br/>Bolt Beranek &amp; Newman, Inc.<br/>50 Moulton Street<br/>Cambridge, MA 02138</p>  |
| <p>1 Dr. Fred Reif<br/>SESAME<br/>c/o Physics Department<br/>University of California<br/>Berkeley, CA 94720</p>                         | <p>1 Dr. Robert Smith<br/>Department of Computer Science<br/>Rutgers University<br/>New Brunswick, NJ 08903</p>   |
| <p>1 Dr. Andrew M. Rose<br/>American Institutes for Research<br/>1055 Thomas Jefferson St. NW<br/>Washington, DC 20007</p>               | <p>1 Dr. Richard Snow<br/>School of Education<br/>Stanford University<br/>Stanford, CA 94305</p>  |
| <p>1 Dr. Ernst Z. Rothkopf<br/>Bell Laboratories<br/>600 Mountain Avenue<br/>Murray Hill, NJ 07974</p>                                   | <p>1 Dr. Robert Sternberg<br/>Dept. of Psychology<br/>Yale University<br/>Box 11A, Yale Station<br/>New Haven, CT 06520</p>                               |
| <p>1 Dr. Irwin Sarason<br/>Department of Psychology<br/>University of Washington<br/>Seattle, WA 98195</p>                               | <p>1 DR. ALBERT STEVENS<br/>BOLT BERANEK &amp; NEWMAN, INC.<br/>50 MOULTON STREET<br/>CAMBRIDGE, MA 02138</p>   |
| <p>1 DR. WALTER SCHNEIDER<br/>DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY<br/>UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS<br/>CHAMPAIGN, IL 61820</p>                                 | <p>1 Dr. Thomas G. Sticht<br/>Director, Basic Skills Division<br/>HUMRRO<br/>300 N. Washington Street<br/>Alexandria, VA 22314</p>                        |
| <p>1 Dr. Alan Schoenfeld<br/>Department of Mathematics<br/>Hamilton College<br/>Clinton, NY 13323</p>                                    | <p>1 David E. Stone, Ph.D.<br/>Hazeltime Corporation<br/>7680 Old Springhouse Road<br/>McLean, VA 22102</p>   |

Non Govt

1 DR. PATRICK SUPPES  
INSTITUTE FOR MATHEMATICAL STUDIES IN  
THE SOCIAL SCIENCES  
STANFORD UNIVERSITY  
STANFORD, CA 94305

1 Dr. Kikumi Tatsuoka  
Computer Based Education Research  
Laboratory  
252 Engineering Research Laboratory  
University of Illinois  
Urbana, IL 61801

1 Dr. David Thissen  
Department of Psychology  
University of Kansas  
Lawrence, KS 66044

1 Dr. Douglas Towne  
Univ. of So. California  
Behavioral Technology Labs  
1845 S. Elena Ave.  
Redondo Beach, CA 90277

1 Dr. J. Uhlaner  
Perceptronic, Inc.  
6271 Variel Avenue  
Woodland Hills, CA 91364

1 Dr. William R. Uttal  
University of Michigan  
Institute for Social Research  
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

1 Dr. Howard Wainer  
Bureau of Social Science Research  
1990 M Street, N. W.  
Washington, DC 20036

1 Dr. Phyllis Weaver  
Graduate School of Education  
Harvard University  
200 Larsen Hall, Appian Way  
Cambridge, MA 02138

1 Dr. David J. Weiss  
N660 Elliott Hall  
University of Minnesota  
75 E. River Road  
Minneapolis, MN 55455

1 Dr. Keith T. Wescourt  
Information Sciences Dept.  
The Rand Corporation  
1700 Main St.  
Santa Monica, CA 90406

1 DR. SUSAN E. WHITELY  
PSYCHOLOGY DEPARTMENT  
UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS  
LAWRENCE, KANSAS 66044

1 Dr. Christopher Wickens  
Department of Psychology  
University of Illinois  
Champaign, IL 61820

1 Dr. J. Arthur Woodward  
Department of Psychology  
University of California  
Los Angeles, CA 90024

DATE  
ILMED  
-8